



**MINUTES**  
**November 2, 2009**

**I. ATTENDANCE**

A. Members:

(O) M. Doyle	(X) P. Robertson
(X) E. Gartland	(X) T. Tuori
(O) R. Jonientz, Chair	(O) T. Zwahlen
(X) R. Pospula	

B. Staff: D. Kirkmire, M. Barry, J. Haremza

**II. MINUTES APPROVAL** – Minutes from October 5, 2009 stand as printed.

**III. PRESENTATION** – **Chuck Thomas, Director of Planning, presented the *Project Green* report.**

**IV. REFERRALS**

**A. Project:** University of Rochester Planned Development District/Master Plan  
**Location:** University of Rochester/Medical Center Campus  
**Lead Agency:** Manager of Zoning  
**Applicant:** University of Rochester  
**Description:** The University of Rochester is proposing to rezone its “City Campus” from Institutional Planned Development (IPD) to Planned Development (PD) in accordance with the 2003 Zoning Code. The Planned Development regulations will set forth parameters under which the University’s Master Plan will be developed.

**Action: No Action due to lack of quorum.**

**B. Project:** Brooks Landing  
**Location:** 1500 S. Plymouth Ave  
**Lead Agency:** Manager of Zoning  
**Applicant:** Ron Christenson  
**Description:** Parcel 3-A: Mixed-use building consisting of a 25 units (85 beds) of student housing and a 5,900 sf restaurant; and, underground parking for 51 cars and a 38-space surface parking lot. Parcel 3-B: ATM Facility. Parcel 3-C: A Jewish Center consisting of a two-story, 7,500 sf building for meeting space, an activity room, sleeping quarters, and a kitchen.

**Action: Moved by Gartland and unanimously approved that the following recommendation be forwarded to the Lead Agency:**

**Recommendation:**

Based on the information provided, the proposed project may cause significant adverse impacts upon the environment. The following reasons support this recommendation:

- 1. Subsurface contamination:** It is unclear whether the subsurface contamination conditions have been adequately considered for the current proposal, which includes residential use and may involve structures with basements. Has the NYS DEC been consulted about how the new proposal may be impacted by the requirements of the prior



environmental management plan for remediation and reuse, or the potential for requiring a new management plan?

2. **Groundwater:** There is insufficient information regarding the potential for construction activities to encounter the groundwater table and how subsurface contamination conditions may impact groundwater.
3. **Parking garage façade:** The façade of the parking garage is not consistent with the use of the adjacent public trail. Information should be provided on alternative treatments and configurations for the building and the parking. An alternative showing the restaurant on the ground floor facing the public space should be provided. If no other configuration is possible, then adequate room should be provided on the site to allow for proper screening (e.g., a berm with landscaping). Also, another alternative to consider would be whether mechanical ventilation of the garage would provide an opportunity for a better façade treatment of the garage.
4. **Storm water management:** More information is needed on storm water management for the site. Monitoring results should be reviewed for the hotel site to ensure that it is adequate before the same system is repeated. Also, additional information is needed on the final topography of the site to ensure that all the drainage from the private development is captured and pretreated and does not runoff the site at all.
5. **Trash storage:** With respect to the trash storage on the site. It appears the volume of trash generation has been underestimated. It also appears that the location where trash storage is proposed for the restaurant/housing building may not accommodate the size truck that would be required. This issue must be addressed in case outdoor storage of trash is necessary. The location of such may be difficult to site on the parcel.
6. **Deliveries:** More information should be provided about deliveries to the site. How many deliveries to each parcel? What size trucks? Where will deliveries be accommodated for each building?
7. **Utilities:** There is insufficient information provided about where utilities are coming into the site and how development may impact the utilities.

## **V. OLD BUSINESS**

- A. Port/ LWRP Amendment/SEIS – No report
- B. Durand Beach Master Plan – No report
- C. Citygate –FGEIS pending
- D. Wegmans East Ave – DEIS pending

## **VI. NEW BUSINESS**

**Prepared By: Dorraine Kirkmire**